

**REMARKS**

With this Amendment, claims 5, 10, and 13-16 are cancelled, and claims 17 and 18 are new. Therefore, claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 12, 17, and 18 are all the claims currently pending in the present Application.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges Applicants' claim to foreign priority and the receipt of the certified copy of the priority document. The Examiner also returns a signed and initialed copy of the substitute PTO Form 1449 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement of April 5, 2004.

**Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 11, and 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Oikawa (U.S. Patent 6,371,609). Claims 4, 9, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Oikawa in view of Kitakami (U.S. Patent 6,601,945). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Oikawa in view of Kitakami and Takeoshi (U.S. Patent 6,960,259). Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Oikawa in view of Chen (U.S. Patent 6,953,244).

Claims 5, 10, and 13-16 are cancelled.

Claims 1 and 11 are amended to include the limitation: "wherein the nozzles making up said first and said second nozzle rows are arranged with a predetermined spacing between adjacent nozzles in a sub-scanning direction; and wherein scanning is carried out by partially overlapping scanning paths of said print head such that a gap created due to said spacing in said

sub-scanning direction is filled in.” Applicants submit that none of the cited references teaches or suggests this limitation.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 11 are patentable and that claims 2-4, and 6-8 are patentable by virtue of their dependence on claim 1.

Claim 9 is amended into independent form and to include the limitation: “wherein each of all the nozzles making up said first nozzle row and each of all the nozzles making up said second nozzle row are arranged such that they are misaligned in a sub-scanning direction by a fixed distance.” Applicants submit that none of the cited references teaches or suggests this limitation, and therefore, claim 9 is patentable.

Claim 12 is amended to include the limitation: “wherein each of all the nozzles making up said first nozzle row and each of all the nozzles making up said second nozzle row are arranged such that they are misaligned in a sub-scanning direction by a fixed distance.” Applicants submit that none of the cited references teaches or suggests this limitation, and therefore, claim 12 is patentable.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, and 12 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### **New Claims**

With this Amendment, Applicants add new claims 17 and 18 in order more fully to cover various aspects of Applicants’ invention as disclosed in the specification. Applicants respectfully request entry and allowance of new claims 17 and 18.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura Moskowitz  
Registration No. 55,470

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 21, 2006